

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

CLYDE RAY SPENCER,

Plaintiff,

v.

CLARK COUNTY, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C11-5424 BHS

ORDER GRANTING
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE
A REPLY

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff's motion for extension of time to file a reply to Defendant Clark County's response to Plaintiff's motion for satisfaction of judgment (Dkt. 307). The Court has considered the pleadings filed in support of and in opposition to the motion and the remainder of the file and hereby grants the motion for the reasons stated herein.

Plaintiff's motion for satisfaction of judgment is noted for May 16, 2014. Dkt. 300. Plaintiff seeks a short extension of time to file a reply, asking the Court to renote the motion to May 21, 2014 because (1) Defendant's response brief is overlength, and (2) Plaintiff's counsel is currently engaged in extensive briefing in another, apparently, complex case. Dkt. 307 at 2.

The Court acknowledges that Defendant Clark County's opposition to Plaintiff's motion for extension is meritorious in the sense that the Court already granted Plaintiff

1 additional pages to respond to Defendant's overlength brief (*see* Dkts. 302 and 309), and
2 Plaintiff noted his motion for May 16, 2014, according to his own timetable. Dkt. 309 at
3 2-3. However, given both the modest extension Plaintiff seeks and Plaintiff's counsel's
4 pressing obligations in another case, the Court, in its discretion, finds good cause exists to
5 extend Plaintiff's reply date to May 21, 2014. In a case as complex as this, where post-
6 trial motions are pending, at least one of which needs to be resolved before Plaintiff's
7 motion for satisfaction of judgment is considered, the Court finds a short extension of
8 time is insignificant and should result in the thorough reply Plaintiff intends to file. Such
9 a thorough, but concise, reply should better assist the Court in resolving Plaintiff's
10 underlying motion.

11 Therefore, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

- 12 1. Plaintiff's motion for extension of time (Dkt. 307) is **GRANTED**; and
- 13 2. The Clerk is directed to renote Plaintiff's motion satisfaction of judgment
14 (Dkt. 300) for consideration on May 21, 2014.

15 Dated this 16th day of May, 2014.

16
17 

18 BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
United States District Judge